UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/610,689	06/30/2003	Douglas R. Carrell	MSFT-1961/303999.1	2918

41505   7590   08/31/2007

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)
CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR
2929 ARCH STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891

EXAMINER
PRICE, NATHAN E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2194	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/31/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/610,689	CARRELL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nathan Price	2194	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) _Kenneth Eiferman_.　　　　　　　　　(3)_Nathan Price_.

(2) _Peter Hernandez_.　　　　　　　　　　(4)_William Thomson_.

　Date of Interview: _23 August 2007_.

　Type:　a)☒　Telephonic　b)☐　Video Conference
　　　　　c)☐　Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant　2)☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted:　d)☐ Yes　e)☒ No.
　If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: _1,14,23 and 32_.

Identification of prior art discussed: _Taylor (see PTO-892 mailed 8/22/2006)_.

Agreement with respect to the claims f)☐ was reached.　g)☒ was not reached.　h)☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _See Continuation Sheet_.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed proposed amendments. The proposed amendments appear to overcome current rejections in view of the portions of the references cited by examiner in prior Office Actions. However, further search and consideration is required. This includes search and consideration of the portions of the references, specifically Taylor, not previously cited by examiner. If an RCE is filed in response to this interview, then another interview will be offered before the next Office Action is mailed.

WOODCOCK WASHBURN

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW

ATLANTA • PHILADELPHIA • SEATTLE

FACSIMILE

DATE: **August 21, 2007**

OFFICIAL PAPER

JOB CODE:

Please deliver this and the following pages to:

Examiner:	**Nathan Price**
U.S.P.T.O. Group Art Unit:	**2194**
Telecopier No.:	**571-273-4196**
U.S. Serial No.:	**10/610,689**
Client/Matter No.:	**MSFT-1961**
Sender's Name:	**Kenneth R Eiferman**
Pages to Follow:	**3**

If transmission is not complete, please call our **Philadelphia Office** at **(215) 568-3100.**

COVER MESSAGE:

OFFICIAL FACSIMILE. PLEASE DELIVER TO EXAMINER IMMEDIATELY.

Attached hereto is/are the following documents:

1)
2)
3)

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP

A Partnership Including Professional Corporations

www.woodcock.com

10/610,689 Agenda for Telephone Interview

1. (currently amended)   A method of enabling a first system to use a second system comprising:

receiving, from the first system, a first request directed to the second system, said first request being in a form adapted for the first system but not for the second system;

performing a first conversion of said first request to produce a second request, said second request being in a form adapted for said second system but not for said first system, said first conversion performed using a host initiated processing (HIP) system that includes one or more listeners for receiving the first request and one or more HIP proxies that handle flow control for the first conversion, the number of listeners and HIP proxies to use in the first conversion is determined by an HIP runtime service based on pre-stored configuration information;

invoking the processing of said second request by the second system;

receiving a first reply from the second system, said reply comprising an FMH7 field, said FMH7 field containing error information;

performing a second conversion of said first reply to produce a second reply that comprises header information that is usable with an Internet protocol and that represents said error information contained in said FMH7 field into header information usable with an Internet protocol; and

providing said second reply to said first system.

14. (currently amended)   A method of enabling a first software object in a first system to call a second software object in a second system, the method comprising:

evaluating first information that the first software object exposes when making a call to a remote system;

evaluating second information that the second software object exposes when receiving a call from a remote system;

generating conversion information descriptive of a process to be followed in order to convert the first information into a form compatible with the second information, said conversion information describing the conversion of an FMH7 field into header information usable with an Internet protocol;

providing the conversion information to a conversion service that uses the conversion information to convert a first call from the first object into a call in a form usable by the second object, said conversion service using a host initiated processing (HIP) system that includes one or more listeners for receiving the first request and one or more HIP proxies that handle flow control for the first conversion, the number of listeners and HIP proxies to use in the first conversion is determined by an HIP runtime service based on pre-stored configuration information.

23. (currently amended)   A system to enable a first software object in a first environment to call a second software object in a second environment, the system comprising:

hardware comprising at least one processor;

a service object that executes on said hardware and that receives a first request from the first software object, converts the first request into a second request which is in a form usable by the second software object, and presents the second request to the second software object;

a host initiated processing (HIP) system that includes one or more listeners for receiving the first request and one or more HIP proxies that handle flow control, the number of listeners and HIP proxies to used is determined by an HIP runtime service based on pre-stored configuration information; and

an error handling object that executes on said hardware and that receives an indication of an error from the second software object and packages the error into a form usable by the first environment or the first software object, wherein the indication of said error comprises an FMH7 field, and wherein said error handling object creates header information representative of the contents of said FMH7 field, said header information being adapted for use with an Internet protocol.

32. (currently amended)   A computer-readable storage medium encoded with computer-executable instructions to facilitate interoperability between a first system and a second system, the instructions being adapted to perform acts comprising:

receiving a first call from a first software object in the first system to a second software object in the second system, the first call being in a format that is not compatible with the second system;

converting the first call into a second call, the second call being in a format that is compatible with the second, said converting performed using a host initiated processing (HIP) system that includes one or more listeners for receiving the first request and one or more HIP proxies that handle flow control for the first conversion, the number of listeners and HIP proxies to use in the first conversion is determined by an HIP runtime service based on pre-stored configuration information;

converting an FMH7 field generated by said first system into header information usable by an Internet protocol;

invoking the second software object using the second call.

REMARKS

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite in part *"said first conversion performed using a host initiated processing (HIP) system that includes one or more listeners for receiving the first request and one or more HIP proxies that handle flow control for the first conversion, the number of listeners and HIP proxies to use in the first conversion is determined by an HIP runtime service based on pre-stored configuration information"*. The other independent claims 14, 23 and 32 have been amended in similar fashion. Support for this amendment can be found for example in Fig. 6 and the accompanying discussion found starting in paragraph [0044] through [0048].

The cited Marcos, Taylor, Lymer and Tannenbaum references taken individually or in combination fail to teach or suggest a host initiated processing system as now recited in all of the independent claims which includes one or more listeners and one or more HIP proxies which work to handle the conversion with the number of listeners and HIP proxies being selected by a HIP runtime service. Although Marcos is concerned with translation between protocols, it fails to teach or suggest an HIP system that includes one or more listeners and HIP proxies whose numbers are selected by an HIP runtime service as now claimed. The other cited references also fail to teach or suggest such a system. Furthermore, as mentioned in the previous response, the use of a header usable with an Internet protocol to represent information contained in the FMH7 field is something that is neither taught or suggested by the references individually or combined.